

**Minutes**  
**Faculty Senate Meeting**  
October 17, 2006

Present: C. Benevides D. Bergeron D. Boerth K. Curran-Kelly  
P. Currier Q. Fan E. Fisher J. Fobanjong  
L. Forker P. Gibbs L. Goodman B. Jacobskind  
Y. Kim R. Kowalczyk S. Krumholz W. LeBlanc  
S. Leclair H. Michel B. Mikolajczak A. Mollo  
D. Rancour F. Scarano B. Singh E. Winiarz

Excused: P. Bacdayan D. Borim L. Brodeur E. Carreiro  
J. Griffith A. Hausknecht A. Klobucka  
G. Koot K. Langley J. Leffers S. Peterson  
T. Puri

Absent: M. Baum B. Bouchard D. Georgianna A. Gunasekaran  
S. Haines R. Laoulache P. Longo B. McFarlane  
J. Marlow G. O'Reilly P. Owens S. Scott  
F. Sousa H. Xu

Guests: A. Garro R. Panofsky A. Costa J. Schaaf  
P. White

Senate President S. Leclair calls the meeting to order at 3:35 pm.

1. Approval of the Minutes for September 28, 2006

P. Gibbs moves to accept. P. Currier seconds. Minutes accepted.

2. Steering Committee reports.

2.1. Evaluation Committee for the Dean of the College of Business. The committee has begun working. They have established a rubric and scheduled a meeting with the provost. It is anticipated they will move forward in a timely manner.

2.2. The replacement for Kevin Stokesbury, who resigned his Senate seat, is Bradley Stevens (SMASST).

2.3. Two additional resignations: Klimt and Notaros. Nominations for these seats will be open until Oct. 27<sup>th</sup>. We will hold an election if necessary.

2.4. Steering committee met with Provost Garro last Friday (Oct. 13, 2006). We will have monthly meetings.

### 3. Committee reports.

3.1 J. Schaaf presents General Education Committee's proposal for altering the E, G and D requirements.

Gave background for proposal. A) concerns with existing program; B) established a committee that represented the university; c) got approval campus-wide for the pilot program. This has been an enormous project and represents four years of work by a committee comprised of two members from each academic council on campus.

A one page document was distributed outlining the plan (attached). Discussion and action are requested. Phase in by 2012.

Open up for discussion.

\*Is this something that the registrar's office can manage?  
Administration would decide how to administer; if they couldn't they would raise that.

\*P. Currier reported that as a participant in the pilot, she found it wonderful how students were able to synthesize a range of materials.

\*All courses would be available without pre or co requisites.

\*How do we get them staffed? Provost Garro noted that this is really an administrative issue. Would need to request of chair; department would decide if they would allow that course to be taught and could be accepted within the major. Garro encourages us to not be concerned with the administrative piece.

\*These would count as service courses.

Provost Garro thanks committee; philosophically he agrees; moving content area out of purview of individual colleges.

\*Problem with professional schools who have many prescribed requirements. Can't add three more credits.

Are there general and specific ethics? Concerns from engineering that this is too much to require. Others felt that ethics would be a broader concern.

In computer and other professional programs, the accrediting agencies prefer a stand-alone course. Nursing view for accreditation – in addition to identifying ethics in the curriculum, you also need to display progression in learning.

Provost Garro suggests if we accept the idea of general education into the curriculum then we don't need a second layer of courses.

B. Jacobskind moves to adopt the proposal presented by the Gen Ed. Curriculum. P. Currier seconds.

Discussion of motion follows. In support of the motion -- incentives are personal, might help recruit majors, inspiring existing classes/pedagogy.

Speaking against - not a clear set of goals. Agrees that gen ed is broken, but we need to consider where we want to go. How are we going to recruit faculty to teach?

The consensus seems to be that this would require a broader conversation. Garro would like this to be embedded in the strategic plan process. B. Jacobskind moves to table her prior motion. E. Fisher seconds. Motion tabled unanimously.

P. Gibbs moves to receive with gratitude and appreciation the report of the General Education Committee and forward the report to the Provost as a white paper for use in the upcoming planning process. E. Fisher seconds. Motion carries.

### 3.2. Honorary Degree Committee.

S. Leclair reports at the request of R. Larcshen who couldn't be present.

They have considered a list of six people as the result of last year's request. No names can become public until it is offered and the person accepts. Entire process is confidential.

### 4. New Business.

Hearing no new business. B. Jacobskind moves to adjourn; P. Gibbs seconds. Motion carries. Meeting adjourns at 5:10 pm.

13 OCTOBER 2006

**PROPOSAL TO THE FACULTY SENATE FROM THE GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE REGARDING  
GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS IN AREAS E, G, AND D**

The following proposal is based upon the conduct and assessment of a Pilot Program in Gen Ed E, D, and G during AY 2005-2006. The *Academic Assessment Report: The Pilot Program in General Education Areas E [Ethics], G [Global Awareness], and D [Diversity]*, dated 1 September 2006, was sent to the Faculty Senate in September 2006. The Gen Ed committee asks that the Faculty Senate deliberate and act upon the following proposal [highlighted below] during the Fall of 2006.

PROPOSAL:

***The General Education Committee proposes that the University phase in the method for delivering Gen Ed E [Ethics], G [Global Awareness] and D [Diversity] courses that was developed in the Pilot Program of Fall 2005, with the goal of retiring the current list-of-courses method by Fall 2012.***

---

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The following recommendations arise from the General Education Committee's assessment of the Pilot Program. These recommendations are separate from, not a part of, the proposal itself. The General Education Committee recommends that:

1. The faculty encourage students, through advising, to select their General Education courses purposefully—for example, to discover a major or minor, to explore unfamiliar areas of interest, or to put together interrelated courses to develop their understanding in an area of knowledge.
2. The College of Arts and Sciences determine whether courses approved for Gen Ed E, G, and D designation meet CAS distribution requirements.
3. Instructors co-ordinate scheduling so that some courses in the same content area [G, G, D] could interact and collaborate in a deliberate and ongoing manner.
4. Instructors build into Gen Ed E, G, and D courses "project-oriented" assignments with practical and palpable results.
5. Instructors include collaborative/cooperative work, formal and/or informal, graded or not, in E, G, and D courses.
6. Instructors include a "W" [writing-intensive] and/or "O" [oral] component in E, G, and D courses.
7. Instructors consider including a shared element [such as a common text or experience—film, performance, demonstration, *etc.*] in courses that share a content area [E, G, D].
8. Instructors contribute to a Faculty Handbook for Gen Ed E, G, and D, with sample syllabi, assignments, handouts, *etc.*, and including information about resources available to faculty teaching collaboratively and innovatively and assessing their work.